REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. These claims were rejected

as follows:

Claims / Section	35 U.S.C. Sec.	References / Notes
16 & 18-20	§102(e) Anticipation	• Navarre (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,482).
1-15	§103(a) Obviousness	• Navarre (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,482); and • Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APPA).

5   Applicant thanks the Examiner for the withdrawal of the last rejection and

provides the discussion below distinguishing the present invention from the art

cited against it and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in light

of these remarks.

          Applicant's use of reference characters below is for illustrative purposes

10   only and is not intended to be limiting in nature unless explicitly indicated.

          In the OA, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 as either being anticipated

by Navarre, or obviated by the combination of Navarre and the admitted prior art

(namely the publication of Jörn Heid, "Hand angelegt" in ix 11/1998, pp. 68-70

(Heid).

15   In the OA the Examiner accepts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Navarre

as Navarre does not disclose that the data files that are transferred contain both

language elements that are executable by the client as well as language

elements that are executable by the server, and that it does not provide an

interpreter that interprets arid executes language elements on the gateway of the

data file. However, the Examiner asserts on p. 6 that the Applicant's admitted

prior art discloses a technique in which it is possible to provide data files at the

server that are called by the client and comprise language elements that can be

executed both at the client as well as at the server. Therefore, one of ordinary

5   skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to

implement or incorporate APPA's data files structured to contain both language

elements executable at said client as well as language elements executable at

said server in Navarre's network in order to execute elements at both the client

and server.

10   In paragraph [0013], it is admitted that it is known to the art to have data

files comprising language elements that can be executed both at the client as

well as at the server. However, these on the server executable language

elements are scripts of a different language, which involves considerable

programming outlay (see paragraph [0027] of the present application).

15   Furthermore, it is not known from the prior art to integrate a gateway in the

interpreter which can be simply called by language elements of the interpreter.

In traditional systems, the corresponding interfaces can only be deposited at the

server as CGI script, servlet, or the like, by way of programs that can be

produced by specialists or must be mapped in an involved way of the known

20   broker system (see paragraph [0028] of the present application).

The Examiner asserts that in Navarre, a gateway is integrated in an

interpreter. However, Navarre is silent with regard to how the gateway

accordingly is called after a corresponding request is received at the server. It

can be implemented in any number of different ways, and there is no teaching as

to which way is used.

Navarre does also not disclose to provide one single date file for

conducting the steps for executing a request from a client application as it is

5   shown in the flow chart of figure 3. In this respect, see Navarre, column 3, lines

56 to 59, which states:

> With the integrated responses, the integrated
> response presentation routine 227 accesses
> application presentation objects, which preferably
> 10   dynamically builds an HTML page for return to the
> client application 210.

If one single data file in HTML-language is provided for executing the

request from a client application, it would not be necessary to dynamically build

an additional HTML page. This is a clear indication that Navarre does not use

15   one single data file for controlling the execution of a request from a client but

uses more than one data file.

A mere combination of Navarre with the publication of Heid does not lead

to the invention. Firstly, there is no hint in Navarre to include all the method

steps as shown in Figure 3 in one single data file. Secondly, the prior art of Heid

20   discloses a use of scripts for language elements to be carried out on the server.

As explained above, it is not possible in traditional systems to include by simple

language elements the control of the periphery devices in a data file, which is to

be carried out at the client. It was only possible to deposit at the server the

control of periphery devices by CGI script, servlets or the like, which can be

25   produced by specialists or must be mapped in an involved way at a known broker

system.

RESPONSE C

In the prior art, there was no integration of the gateway into a programming language which comprises language elements to be carried out at the server and at the client

5   As it was not known to integrate a gateway in an interpreter and which can be called by language elements of the interpreter directly from a data file containing also language elements executable at the client, there was no hint to use one single data file for carrying out the methods according to Navarre.

In a preferred embodiment, the language elements executable at the
10   client correspond to a mark-up language (such as SGML, HTML, XML) (see paragraph [0031]). Preferably, the commands executable by the interpreter correspond to the syntax of this mark-up language (see paragraph [0053]). Thus, the user can easily produce complex applications and controlling via the gateway devices, like printers. The user does not need to have knowledge of further
15   languages which could be implemented by way of scripts into a data file of a mark-up language.

For these reasons, the Applicant asserts that the indepdenent claim language clearly distinguishes over the prior art, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §§ 102, 103 rejections from the present application.

20   **CONCLUSION**

Inasmuch as each of the objections have been overcome by the amendments, and all of the Examiner's suggestions and requirements have been satisfied, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered,

the rejections be withdrawn and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in

this case.

Respectfully submitted,

5

/s/ Mark Bergner/ (Reg. No. 45,877)
Mark Bergner
SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
6600 Sears Tower
10   Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473
(312) 258-5779
Attorney for Applicants
Customer Number 26574

15   **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450 on _February 16, 2006_ .

20

Pam Vander Meer

25

6   RESPONSE C